

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-4 and 13-16 remain in this application. Claims 1-24 are rejected. Claims 5-12 and 17-24 are cancelled herein. Claims 1, 3, 13-16 are amended herein to clarify the invention and to address matters of form unrelated to substantive patentability issues.

**CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected as obvious over the Mozer reference in view of the von Bauer reference under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claims 3 and 4 are rejected as obvious over the Mozer reference in view of the von Bauer reference and further in view of Nakamura under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claims 5-8 are rejected as obvious over the Mozer reference in view of the von Bauer reference and further in view of Nakamura and further in view of Scott under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claims 9-24 are rejected as obvious over the Mozer reference in view of the von Bauer, Nakamura, Scott and Setlak references under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The applicant herein respectfully traverses these rejection. For a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) to be sustained, the differences between the features of the combined references and the present invention must be obvious to one skilled in the art.

Claim 1 is now amended to include subject matter of canceled claim 9 which was rejected in part based upon the Setlak reference. The present invention of claim 1 utilizes the call button or existing message button to discharge the static electricity. This simplifies the wireless call system to allow static discharge without adding special part provide for static draining. Therefore, the present invention of claim 1 the size of the fingerprint inputting means to be kept small while it can discharge the static electricity. In addition, since the present invention of claim 1 utilizes the call button or message button to enable discharging the static electricity, the call button or message button serves as a guide to be able to simply and surely discharge the static electricity.

On the other hand, Setlak is specially provided with a first external electrode 54 for discharging static electricity adjacent to the sensing integrated circuit 40 as the part of a fingerprint sensor package 30. Therefore, Setlak does not utilize the existing call button or existing message button to discharge the static electricity unlike the present invention of claim 1. Namely, Setlak specially adds the first external electrode 54 to the fingerprint sensor package 30 so that the size of the fingerprint sensor package and whole system increases.


Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejected claims are not obvious in view of the cited references for the reasons stated above. Reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1-4 and 13-16 and their allowance are respectfully requested.

**TIME EXTENSION REQUEST**


Applicant respectfully requests a one month extension of time for responding to the Office Action. Please charge the fee of \$120.00 for the extension of time to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Please charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

Respectfully submitted,  
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By   
C. Bruce Hamburg  
Reg. No. 22,389  
Attorney for Applicants

 and,

By   
Herbert F. Ruschmann  
Reg. No. 35,341  
Attorney for Applicants

Jordan and Hamburg LLP  
122 East 42nd Street  
New York, New York 10168  
(212) 986-2340